(3)
CHMJ

BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P.No. . . . . 2643 / .2003

Petitioner : S. L. Verma, aged 39 years,
S/o late Tej Ram Verma,
Training Officer (Welder),
Industrial Training Institute,
Bhilai.

Versus.

Respondents : 1. State Government of Chhattisgarh,
Through - The Secretary
D.K.S. Bhawan, RAIPUR (C.G.).

2. Joint Director,
Employment and Training Directorate,
Bairan Bazar,
Mahila Polytechnic Campus,
Raipur (C.G.).

3. Principal,
Industrial Training Institute,
Bhilai, Distt. Durg (C.G.).

P.R. No. ..... Presented by Shri R.S. Shrivastava dated 26.6.03

Petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India

XI-HC-22

(33)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.2643/ सन् 2003

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	03.09.2003 Shri R.S. Shrivastava, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Ranbir Singh, Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents. Heard both the counsel. By this writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has challenged the order dated 01.07.2003 by which the Joint Director, Employment & Training, Mahila Polytechnic Campus, Raipur, has rejected the representation of the petitioner on the ground that it was not filed within the time prescribed by the High Court. The petitioner had earlier filed a writ petition bearing No.569/2003 seeking relief that even after the completion of the period of probation, the petitioner is not being given the increments, whereas increments have been given by the respondents to other similarly placed persons. After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court vide order dated 26.04.2003 allowed the petitioner to make a detailed representation within a period of 15 days to the Joint Director. However, the petitioner failed to make representation within the stipulated time. Therefore, the Joint Director rejected the representation merely on the ground that the representation has not been preferred within the time schedule given by the Court. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that on account of marriage in the family and other family related problems the petitioner could make representation within the time given by the Court.	

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(34)

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.2643/ सन् 2003

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

Therefore, the Joint Director ought to have considered the difficulty of the petitioner and could have decided the representation on its merits.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is again allowed to make a detailed representation to respondent No.2 within a period of 15 days from today and on the receipt of the representation, the concerned authority shall decide the same and pass a detailed and appropriate order in an objective manner within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the representation.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of.

In view of this order, M.(W.)P.No.2424/2003 and I.A.No.8019/2003 also stand disposed of.

Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.

Sd/-
L.C.BHADOO
Judge

Soma

[पीछे देखिये